

Approved For Release 2001/08/29 : CIA-RDP74-00390R000300180003

130862

Appendix IV

Support Services Staff

The overall statement of objectives for the Support Services Staff FY 1973 -1977 is the clearest such statement of objectives in the Support Offices' Program Submissions (page 4 of SSS Program Submission).

1. Regulations Control

(a) Though no existing objectives are stated as having been fully met, the whole treatment of objectives is good. Objectives are stated as objectives. Specific objectives for existing and new "programs" are stated.

(b) Priority objectives are not specifically stated.

(c) The failures mentioned lie with initiators of regulations and co-ordinators of regulations. No specific failures are mentioned as RCB's.

(d) Method of Approach is clearly stated.

(e) A pre-set course is outlined as a method of approach to achieving program objectives. An analysis of alternative means to achieving RCB's program objectives is not presented. Nor are alternative uses of RCB's resources considered in support of achieving higher priority SSS, Support or Agency program objectives.

(f) Risks and uncertainties regarding RCB's achievement of its program objectives are not mentioned. Is there any risk involved? What level of risk is there to the Agency, DDS, SSS if RCB's program objectives are not met?

(g) RCB has to obviously do a lot of coordinating with other Support Offices and other Directorates. The Program Submission reads "the co-ordination process of approving regulatory proposals is considered sound." Yet, this coordination allows for delay, and wrecks the timeliness goal of RCB. It seems evident that joint planning between RCB and initiating and coordinating offices is needed. It is needed to find ways to improve the quality of initiations and to end bottlenecks in the coordination process.

(h) Due to the limited program dollars involved, any exhaustive program evaluation may not be justified. There are hints of an informal "program evaluation" of RCB programs in the discussion under Method of Approach in RCB's Program Submission.

Approved For Release 2001/08/29 : CIA-RDP74-00390R000300180003
(1) Treatment of Real Program Costs is not mentioned in RCB's Program Submission.

~~SECRET~~

2. Records Administration

(a) The existing objectives are well stated, but the question of review and evaluation of these existing objectives remains open. The new objectives listed for FY 1973-1977 are not objectives. The establishment of staffs, positions, functions and tasks are not objectives, rather they are potential alternative means to achieve some unstated objective. The underlying objective seems to be empire building. Empire building is probably not the objective. What are RAB's new program objectives that might require the resources mentioned under objectives? No objectives are stated as fully met. New objectives are not defined as to what, how and for whom.

(b) RAB has not specifically identified its priority program objectives. Which objectives are vital to this Agency so that overall Agency program objectives can be met? How do RAB's priority objectives (when stated) relate to other SSS, Support and other Directorate priority program objectives? What will it cost the Agency in terms of achieving overall Agency objectives, if RAB does or does not get the resources it has requested?

(c) No specific mention of failure.

(d) As outlined, RAB's methods of approach to achieving its new "objectives" are the pre-set alternatives presented as objectives.

(e) While there is an attempt at analysis of alternatives, the analysis is not exhaustive. It is not clear as to benefits to be derived from each alternative. What is the cost to the Agency in terms of benefits foregone if one alternative is chosen over others? In terms of overall Support priority objectives, what costs are there to the DDS and the Agency if the alternatives proposed by RAB are or are not implemented?

(f) Under risks and uncertainties, RAB has not presented to the DD/S their estimates of the risk involved in achieving or not achieving the "objectives" proposed in the Program Submission. Risks, at a minimum, are subjective probabilities as to the cost to the DDS and Agency of achieving or not achieving the program objectives proposed. The RAB Program Submission leaves the DD/S in a state of uncertainty as to cost risks involved in RAB's program proposals.

(g) There is evidence of coordination and joint planning in RAB's Program Submission. There is considerable room for more joint planning between RAB and other elements of SSS and other Support Offices and other Directorates.

More joint planning by RAB with the above could bring out the priorities involved in RAB's proposed program objectives. There are implied costs to be considered by SSS/IPB, other Support Offices and other Directorates. Are the costs involved to other Agency components of RAB achieving or not achieving its proposed program objectives of great enough nature to define the need or lack of need of RAB's program objectives?

(h) There is no real program evaluation nor analysis of real program costs in RAB's portion of the SSS Program Submission.

3. Information Processing

(a) No indication is given as to a rigorous review and evaluation of existing program objectives. Specific existing and new objectives are given. No statement of specific objectives having been met, though certain tasks were completed. No indication as to resources freed by completion of certain tasks. Objectives are not defined in terms of what the program is really trying to accomplish, how these objectives interrelate with other priority objectives of Support Offices and other Directorates, and who are the target groups for the outputs of the SSS/IPS programs.

(b) There is no analysis of marginally low areas to be decreased or terminated.

(c) Priorities are not outlined. What are the priorities of the SSS/IPS "programs" in relation to other Support and other Directorate priority programs?

(d) No mention of failure.

(e) Method of approach is sketchy. There is seemingly a contradiction in the Human Resources method of approach. That is, "During the planning period the HRS will be improved and frozen 'versus' analysis and design of new requirements will occur." Nowhere in the method of approach is there discussed which, how, why and for whom the simulation, modeling and statistical techniques are to be utilized.

(f) The presentation on alternatives considered in achieving program objectives is lacking. Alternatives present the cost picture to management. No picture is presented.

(g) An evaluation of risks involved is not really presented. What are the probabilities of achieving or not achieving program objectives? What are the probabilities of other Support or other Directorates achieving or not achieving overall Agency priority program objectives if SSS/IPB does or does not achieve its program objectives? DDS management is left in a state of uncertainty regarding the costs of SSS/IPB's programs.

(h) Though there is mention of coordination and joint planning between SSS/IPB and other components, the fact remains that the priority structure of the systems being developed are not presented in the Program Submission. More joint planning seems necessary to establish the priority of program objectives. There is real need of joint planning between SSS/IPB and SSS/RAB and the O/DDS as to what happens to SIPS after it is implemented. How is the DDS going to manage its systems, old and new?

(i) No real program evaluation nor analysis of real program costs has been presented to DDS management.

SECRET